Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Notice that claims 3-5 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten as suggested in the Office Action is acknowledged with appreciation.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Min et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 features determining a head positioning profile for the at least one track using the track profile and the adjacent track profile. The Office Action contends that Min et al. show this feature at paragraph 66, lines 1-4. This contention is incorrect.

That disclosures in Min et al. states:

> Process step 232 continues the track closure error resolution process 220 by establishing a track closure profile (such as 190) to dissipate track closure errors, discovered during process step 230, over the plurality of servo sectors of the information track.

This disclosure simply states that a track closure profile is established to dissipated track closure errors over the plurality of servo sectors of the information track. Yet that disclosure nowhere shows determining a head positioning profile for the at least one track using the track profile and the adjacent track profile, much less anything regarding an adjacent track profile. Since Min et al. do not identically show this feature, claim 1 is not anticipated and is therefore allowable. Claim 2 is also allowable due to its dependence on allowable claim 1.

Claim 6 features using track profile information for a track being ZAPed in addition to track profile information for a track adjacent to the track being ZAPed when ZAPing the track. Claim 11 features means for using track profile information for a track being ZAPed in addition to track profile information for a track adjacent to the track being ZAPed when ZAPing the track. The Office Action contends that Min et al. show this feature at paragraphs 65, lines 7-12 and 66, lines 1-4. This contention is also incorrect.

Paragraph 65, lines 7-12, states:

> The indifference and value, or changing value, of the repeatable run-out values of the pair of adjacent servo tracks is compared with a predetermined value of a track closure threshold value C.sub.t to identify the presence of a track closure error in either of the pair of adjacent servo tracks in process step 230.

If the Office Action means that adjacent servo tracks are the same as track profile information for a track adjacent as featured in claim 6, that meaning is erroneous. The term "adjacent servo tracks" is a typographical error considering the flow chart in Fig. 9, particularly step 228, and the remaining disclosure of that reference. Since that term should be "adjacent servo sectors," such disclosure is not the same as the using track profile information for a track adjacent to the track being ZAPed when ZAPing the track. As such, claims 6 and 11 are not anticipated and are allowable. Claims 7 and 12 are also allowable due to their respective dependence on allowable claims 6 and 11.

Conclusion

This Reply is believed to be responsive to all points raised in the Office action. Accordingly, prompt allowance and passage of the application to issue are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, he/she is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Seagate Technology LLC
(Assignee of the Entire Interest)

5/25/05
Date

David K. Lucente, Reg. No. 36,202
Seagate Technology LLC
Intellectual Property Dept. – COL2LGL
389 Disc Drive
Longmont, CO 80503
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)